

Measurements of the CKM angle ϕ_3/γ

T.A.-Kh. Aushev

for the Belle Collaboration
 Swiss Federal Institute of Technology of Lausanne, Switzerland
 Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
 aushev@itep.ru

Abstract. In this report we summarize the most recent results of measurements of the angle γ/ϕ_3 of the Unitarity Triangle.

Keywords: CKM, angle, ϕ_3 , γ

1. INTRODUCTION

Measurements of the Unitarity Triangle parameters allow to search for New Physics effects at low energies. One angle, ϕ_1 (or β)¹, has been measured with high precision at BaBar and Belle experiments, the B factories operated at the e^+e^- colliders with the center-of-mass energy at $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. The measurements of the angle ϕ_2/α is more difficult due to theoretical uncertainties in the calculation of the penguin diagram contribution. Precise determination of the third angle, ϕ_3/γ , is possible, *e.g.*, in the decays $B^\pm \rightarrow DK^\pm$. Although it is theoretically clean due to the absence of loop contributions, it requires a lot more data than for the other angles. This report summarizes the most recent progress in measuring the angle ϕ_3/γ .

2. GLW ANALYSES

The theoretically clean measurement technique was suggested by Gronau, London, and Wyler (GLW). It exploits the interference between $B^- \rightarrow D^0 K^-$ and $B^- \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^-$ decay amplitudes, where the D^0 and $\bar{D}^0$ mesons decay to the same CP eigenstate (CP -even $D_1 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$, $\pi^+ \pi^-$ and CP -odd $D_2 \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^0$, $K_S^0 \omega$, $K_S^0 \phi \dots$) [1]. The following variables are used to extract ϕ_3 using the GLW method: the asymmetries

$$\mathcal{A}_{1,2} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D_{1,2} K^-) - \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_{1,2} K^+)}{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D_{1,2} K^-) + \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_{1,2} K^+)} = \frac{2r_B \sin \delta' \sin \phi_3}{1 + r_B^2 + 2r_B \cos \delta' \cos \phi_3} \quad (1)$$

and the ratios

$$\mathcal{R}_{1,2} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D_{1,2} K^-) + \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_{1,2} K^+)}{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^0 K^-) + \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D^0 K^+)} = 1 + r_B^2 + 2r_B \cos \delta' \cos \phi_3, \quad (2)$$

¹ Two different notations of the Unitarity Triangle are used: α , β , γ or ϕ_2 , ϕ_1 and ϕ_3 , respectively.

TABLE 1. Results of the GLW analyses

	BaBar	Belle
$\mathcal{R}_1$	$1.06 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.05$	$1.13 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.05$
$\mathcal{R}_2$	$1.03 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.05$	$1.17 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.14$
$\mathcal{A}_1$	$0.27 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.04$	$0.06 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.05$
$\mathcal{A}_2$	$-0.09 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.02$	$-0.12 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.05$
x_+	$-0.09 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$	$-0.06 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.05$
x_-	$0.10 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.03$	$0.04 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.04$
r_B^2	$0.05 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.03$	$0.15 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.08$

where $\delta' = \delta_B$ for D_1 and $\delta_B + \pi$ for D_2 and $r_B \equiv |A(B^- \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^-)/A(B^- \rightarrow D^0 K^-)|$ is the ratio of the $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}s$ and $b \rightarrow u\bar{c}s$ magnitudes, δ_B is their strong-phase difference. It can also be expressed in terms of three independent quantities:

$$x_{\pm} = r_B \cos(\delta_B \pm \phi_3) = \frac{\mathcal{R}_1(1 + \mathcal{A}_1) - \mathcal{R}_2(1 + \mathcal{A}_2)}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad r_B^2 = \frac{\mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2 - 2}{2}. \quad (3)$$

Recently, BaBar updated their GLW analysis using the data sample of 382M $B\bar{B}$ pairs [2]. These results are presented in Table 1. Also results from Belle using 275M $B\bar{B}$ pairs are shown [3].

3. ADS METHOD

The difficulties in the application of the GLW methods arise primarily due to the small magnitude of the CP asymmetry of the $B^+ \rightarrow D_{CP} K^+$ decay probabilities, which may lead to significant systematic uncertainties in the observation of the CP violation. An alternative approach was proposed by Atwood, Dunietz and Soni [4]. Instead of using the D^0 decays to CP eigenstates, the ADS method uses Cabibbo-favored and doubly Cabibbo-suppressed decays: $\bar{D} \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ and $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$. In the decays $B^+ \rightarrow [K^- \pi^+]_D K^+$ and $B^- \rightarrow [K^+ \pi^-]_D K^-$, the suppressed B decay corresponds to the Cabibbo-allowed D^0 decay, and vice versa. Therefore, the interfering amplitudes are of similar magnitudes, and one can expect the significant CP asymmetry.

Unfortunately, the branching ratios of the decays mentioned above are so small that they cannot be observed using the current experimental statistics. The observable that is measured in the ADS method is the fraction of the suppressed and allowed branching ratios:

$$\mathcal{R}_{ADS} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^{\pm} \rightarrow [K^{\mp} \pi^{\pm}]_D K^{\pm})}{\mathcal{B}(B^{\pm} \rightarrow [K^{\pm} \pi^{\mp}]_D K^{\pm})} = r_B^2 + r_D^2 + 2r_B r_D \cos \phi_3 \cos \delta, \quad (4)$$

where r_D is the ratio of the doubly Cabibbo-suppressed and Cabibbo-allowed D^0 decay amplitudes:

$$r_D = \left| \frac{A(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-)}{A(D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+)} \right| = 0.0578 \pm 0.0008, \quad (5)$$

and δ is a sum of strong phase differences in B and D decays: $\delta = \delta_B + \delta_D$.

TABLE 2. Results of the Dalitz plot analyses

	BaBar	Belle
ϕ_3/γ	$76^{+23}_{-24} \circ \pm 5^\circ \pm 5^\circ (3.0\sigma \text{ CPV})$	$76^{+12}_{-13} \circ \pm 4^\circ \pm 9^\circ (3.5\sigma \text{ CPV})$
r_B	$0.086 \pm 0.035 \pm 0.010 \pm 0.011$	$0.16 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.05$
r_B^*	$0.135 \pm 0.051 \pm 0.011 \pm 0.005$	$0.21 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.05$

The update of the ADS analysis using 657M $B\bar{B}$ pairs is reported by Belle [5]. In the absence of the signal the ratio of the suppressed and allowed modes is measured to be: $\mathcal{R}_{ADS} < 1.8 \times 10^{-2}$ at 90% C.L., which corresponds to $r_B < 0.19$.

Recently, the ADS analysis has been performed by BaBar using $B^0 \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^{*0}$ decay modes with $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+, K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$ or $K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$, based on 465M $B\bar{B}$ events [6]. Neglecting K^{*0} final state interference and combining three D^0 decay modes the 95% probability range for r_S is found to be:

$$\mathcal{R}_{ADS} \approx r_s^2 = \frac{\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow D^0 K^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow D^0 K^+ \pi^-)} = [0.07, 0.41]. \quad (6)$$

4. DALITZ PLOT ANALYSES

A Dalitz plot analysis of a D meson three-body final state allows to obtain all the information required for a ϕ_3 determination. Three-body final states such as $K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$ [7, 8] have been suggested as promising modes for the extraction of ϕ_3 . Like GLW or ADS method, the two amplitudes interfere as the D^0 and $\bar{D}^0$ mesons decay into the same final state $K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$. Once the $D^0 \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$ decay amplitude, f_D , is known, a simultaneous fit of B^+ and B^- data allows the contributions of r_B , ϕ_3 and δ_B to be separated.

Both Belle and BaBar collaborations reported recently the updates of the ϕ_3/γ measurements using Dalitz plot analysis. The preliminary results obtained by Belle [9] uses the data sample of 657M $B\bar{B}$ pairs and two modes, $B^\pm \rightarrow DK^\pm$ and $B^\pm \rightarrow D^* K^\pm$ with $D^* \rightarrow D\pi^0$. The neutral D meson is reconstructed in $K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$ final state in both cases. The f_D is determined from a large sample of flavor-tagged $D^0 \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$ decays produced in continuum e^+e^- annihilation.

BaBar uses a smaller data sample of 383M $B\bar{B}$ pairs [10], but analyses seven different decay modes: $B^\pm \rightarrow DK^\pm$, $B^\pm \rightarrow D^* K^\pm$ with $D^* \rightarrow D\pi^0$ and $D\gamma$, and $B^\pm \rightarrow DK^{*\pm}$, where the neutral D meson is reconstructed in $K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$ and $K_S^0 K^+ K^-$ (except for $B^\pm \rightarrow DK^{*\pm}$) final states. The K-matrix formalism is used by default to describe the $\pi\pi$ S-wave, while the $K\pi$ S-wave is parametrized using $K_0^*(1430)$ resonances and as effective range non-resonant component with a phase shift.

The results of both analyses are summarized in Table 2.

5. $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-} \pi^+$ ANALYSES

The study of the time-dependent decay rates of $B^0(\bar{B}^0) \rightarrow D^{*\mp} \pi^\pm$ provides a theoretically clean method for extracting $\sin(2\phi_1 + \phi_3)$ from the interference of doubly Cabibbo-suppressed (DCS) $b \rightarrow u$ and Cabibbo-favored (CF) $b \rightarrow c$ amplitudes. The CP violation

parameters are given by

$$S^\pm = -2R\sin(2\phi_2 + \phi_3 \pm \delta), \quad (7)$$

where δ is the strong phase difference between DCS and CF decays. Since the ratio R of these two amplitudes is small, ≈ 0.02 [11], the amount of CP violation is expected to be small and a large data sample is needed in order to obtain sufficient sensitivity. Recently, Belle updated their result using 657M BB pairs data sample with a partial reconstruction technique, wherein the signal is distinguished from background on the basis of kinematics of the 'fast' pion (π_f) from $B \rightarrow D^* \pi_f$, and the 'soft' pion (π_s) from the subsequent decay of $D^* \rightarrow D\pi_s$; the D meson is not reconstructed at all [12]. To suppressed the increased background a high momentum lepton is required in the event. This lepton also provides the information about the flavor and decay vertex of the tagging B meson, which is necessary for the time-dependent analysis. The vertex of the signal B is reconstructed using 'fast' pion only.

The fit results using the partial reconstruction method are:

$$S^+ = +0.057 \pm 0.019 \pm 0.012,$$

$$S^- = +0.038 \pm 0.020 \pm 0.010,$$

with 2.6σ significance of a non-zero CP violation. Together with other measurements the significance of CP violation in $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}h$ decays is $\approx 4.0\sigma$.

6. CONCLUSION

In the past year, many new measurements of angle ϕ_3/γ are provided by Belle and BaBar. The most precise measurements are performed using Dalitz plot analyses of $B \rightarrow DK$ decays in a good agreement between both experiments.

REFERENCES

1. M. Gronau, D. London, D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B **253**, 483 (1991); M. Gronau, D. London, D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B **265**, 172 (1991).
2. B. Aubert *et al.* (The BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **77**, 111102 (2008).
3. K. Abe *et al.* (The Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **73**, 051106(R) (2006).
4. D. Atwood, I. Dunietz, A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3357 (1997).
5. Y. Horii *et al.* (The Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **78**, 071901 (2008).
6. B. Aubert *et al.* (The BaBar Collaboration), arXiv:0904.2112.
7. A. Giri, Yu. Grossman, A. Soffer, J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 054018 (2003).
8. A. Bondar. Proceedings of BINP Special Analysis Meeting on Dalitz Analysis, 24-26 Sep. 2002, unpublished.
9. K. Abe *et al.* (The Belle Collaboration), arXiv:0803.3375.
10. B. Aubert *et al.* (The BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **78**, 034023 (2008).
11. D.A. Suprun, C.-W. Chiang and J.L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 054025 (2002).
12. I. Adachi *et al.* (The Belle Collaboration), arXiv:0809.3203.